UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,437	01/27/2000	Hatim Yousef Amro	AT9-99-483	9872

39698 7590 06/22/2005

DUKE W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, PHUOC H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/492,437	AMRO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuoc H. Nguyen	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 03/07/2005.

2. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25, and 27 are independent claims. This Office Action is made non-final.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 15-18 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-18 and 25-26 recite a computer program product in computer readable media but they fails to limit the computer readable media only as tangible medium. In the specification page 20 lines 8-11, the computer readable media is defined as either recordable-type and transmission-type including digital and analog communication links. In order for computer readable media claims to be statutory, they must be only tangible computer readable medium. Therefore, claims 15-18 and 25-26 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-7, and 9-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Budin et al. (U.S. 5,276,703) in view of Eerola (U.S. 6,678,518).

Regarding claim 1, Budin et al. disclose in Figures 1 and 3 a system for providing dynamically shared documents, comprising: a hub (e.g. 12 in Figure 1 or 30 in Figure 3), wherein the hub is not connected to any external network (e.g. Figure 1 is a complete enclosed network as access point hub in wireless network, the wireless hub unit does not connect to any other switch/hub/router to any other network); and a plurality of computing devices in physical proximity with the hub (e.g. 14a-14g must be within a defined range to communicate with others; the further away from the hub unit, the weaker signal would be and eventually no communication is possible due to noise); wherein each of the plurality of computing devices communicates with the hub via only a wireless connection (e.g. all the subscriber unit "SU" must communicate through hub unit by wireless medium as seen in Figures 1 and 3 with label as 16 for down-link and 18 for up-link); the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices of the plurality of computing devices (e.g. inherently for the property of hub unit). Budin et al. do not disclose clearly each of the plurality of computing devices translates each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested documents to the hub; and each of the plurality of computing devices

translates each received documents from the hub. However, Eerola discloses a system for translating each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested documents to the hub; and vice versa (e.g. col. 2 lines 4-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add a step of translating each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested documents to the hub; and vice versa as seen in Eerola's invention into Budin et al.'s invention because it would allow different systems to communicate each other.

Regarding claims 2-3, Budin et al. do not disclose the system independent language is either a Java or an extensible markup language. However, Eerola discloses the system independent language is either a Java or an extensible markup language (e.g. col. 2 lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add a unified independent language as either Java or extensible markup language as seen in Eerola's invention into Budin et al.'s invention because it would enable other devices within network to easily and compatibly accessing or communicating each other.

Regarding claim 4, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 the hub is portable (e.g. 12 or 30 as home used hub).

Regarding claim 5, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 at least one of the plurality of computing devices is a PDA (e.g. SU as PDA).

Regarding claim 6, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 at least one of the plurality of computing devices is a laptop computer (e.g. SU as laptop).

Regarding claim 7, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 2 at least one of the plurality of computing devices is portable (e.g. laptop is portable).

Regarding claim 9, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are infrared transmissions (e.g. either 16 or 18).

Regarding claim 10, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are radio frequency transmissions (e.g. either 16 or 18).

Regarding claim 11, it is a method claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 the strength of the wireless communication signal is such that only devices in close proximity with each other may receive the signal, thus ensuring that only authorized recipients receive information conveyed via the wireless communication signal (e.g. inherently only devices or SU within the predetermined radius of hub unit radiates signal would communicate. Other devices outside that predetermined range would not able to communicate due to high SNR).

Regarding claim 13, it is a method claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 13 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Regarding claim 14, it is a method claim of claim 3. Thus, claim 14 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Regarding claim 15, it is a program claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 15 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, it is a program claim of claim 12. Thus, claim 16 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 12.

Regarding claim 17, it is a program claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 17 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, it is a program claim of claim 3. Thus, claim 18 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, it is a system means claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 19 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, it is a system means claim of claim 12. Thus, claim 20 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 12.

Regarding claim 21, it is a system means claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 21 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Regarding claim 22, it is a system means claim of claim 3. Thus, claim 22 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Regarding claim 23, Budin et al. disclose in Figures 1 and 3 a method in a data processing system for facilitating communications between a plurality of other data processing systems, comprising the steps of: receiving a request in a system independent format from a first data processing system via only a wireless communication link; broadcasting the request to a second data processing system via only the wireless communication link; receiving an answer in a system independent format from the second data processing system via only the wireless communication link; and broadcasting the answer to the first data processing system via only the

wireless communication link (e.g. properties of hub as a replicator wherein the hub re-transmits exactly all the received data to all the port or to all wireless devices).

Regarding claim 24, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 the wireless communication link utilizes infrared frequencies (e.g. 16 or 18).

Regarding claim 25, it is a program claim of claim 23. Thus, claim 25 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 23.

Regarding claim 26, it is a program claim of claim 24. Thus, claim 26 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 24.

Regarding claim 27, it is a system means claim of claim 23. Thus, claim 27 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 23.

Regarding claim 28, it is a system means claim of claim 24. Thus, claim 28 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 24.

Regarding claim 29, Budin et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3 the hub is a wireless hub (e.g. 12 or 30), which communicates with computing devices via only wireless communication links (e.g. as indicate with links 16 and 18).

8. Claim 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Budin et al. (U.S. 5,276,703) and Eerola (U.S. 6,678,518) further in view of Koperda (U.S. 5,790,806).

Budin et al. disclose in Figures 1 and 3 a system for providing dynamically shared documents and Eerola discloses a system for translating each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested documents to the hub; however, Budin

and Eerola fail to disclose clearly the transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted.

Koperda discloses the transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted (col. 4 lines 37-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add a step of adding the encrypted feature in the transmissions between devices and the hub as seen in Koperda's invention into Budin et al.'s and Eerola invention because it would provides an effective way to achieve data security when different systems to communicate each other.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuoc H Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

June 14, 2005

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER